arXiv:1601.03600v2 [hep-th] 6 May 2016

On one-loop corrections in the CPT-even extension of QED

T. Mariz,[1] J. R. Nascimento,[2] A. Yu. Petrov,[2] and H. Belich[3]

[1]*Instituto de Física, Universidade Federal de Alagoas, 57072-270, Maceió, Alagoas, Brazil*[*]

[2]*Departamento de Física, Universidade Federal da Paraíba Caixa Postal 5008, 58051-970, João Pessoa, Paraíba, Brazil*[†]

[3]*Departamento de Física e Química, Universidade Federal do Espírito Santo, Av. Fernando Ferrari, 514, Goiabeiras, 29060-900, Vitória, ES, Brazil.*[‡]

Abstract

In this paper, we describe the generation of the CPT-even, aether-like terms via the new CPT-even magnetic-like coupling. We carry out a study the loop corrections generated by this coupling. Previous investigations has been initiated on this issue and we have extended them to studying of higher-point functions, of quantum corrections to vertices of the interaction and to two-point function of the spinor field.

[*]Electronic address: tmariz@fis.ufal.br

[†]Electronic address: jroberto, petrov@fisica.ufpb.br

[‡]Electronic address: belichjr@gmail.com

I. INTRODUCTION

The discovery of the Higgs boson in 2013 confirmed the physical interpretation of particles as the manifestation of the excitations of quantized fields described by the Standard Model of the fundamental interactions. Despite the successful program of the Standard Model, the proposal depends on 19 parameters that need to agree with experiments in order to indicate if it is really an appropriate theory. Moreover, the unification of the fields in the Standard Model remains incomplete. The electromagnetic and weak fields are unified in the Weinberg-Salam model [1], the strong field is apart from them (the gauge sector of the Standard Model is $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$), and the gravitational interaction is conserved apart. Besides, in the Standard Model we have the problem of the mass of the Higgs boson that diverges heading towards the Planck scale, and we do not have a satisfactory response to the problem of matter-antimatter asymmetry. Neutrinos appear to be massless particles in the Standard Model, which contradicts experiments of the nineties that observed neutrinos oscillation.

It is well-known that the SM of particle physics did not succeed to explain the origin of the electric dipole moment (EDM) of electron, d_e, and its experimental upper bounds [2]. Theories beyond the SM predict a small, but potentially measurable EDM ($d_e \leq 10^{-29}\,\mathrm{e}\cdot\mathrm{cm}$) [3], which presents an asymmetric charge distribution along the spin axis. Therefore, with this experimental result, it is necessary to investigate the physics beyond the Standard Model.

These restricted possibilities of SM extensions motivated proposal to create effective models which can give us hints about a more fundamental theory. In 1989, in a string theory environment, Kostelecký and Samuel [4] realized an interesting possibility in order to establish the spontaneous breaking of Lorentz symmetry through vacuum expected values of vector or tensor fields based on a string field theory environment. A consistent description of fluctuations around this new vacuum is obtained if the components of the background field are constant, and by the fact that this new minimum be a background not scalar, the Lorentz symmetry is spontaneously broken [5].

The idea of this proposal is to investigate the presence of background fields which

causes anisotropy in space-time, since it can affect the physical properties of the particles. The detection of fields that comes from this breaking of symmetry can be view through a change in the kinetic properties of the particles, therefore, the breaking of symmetry induces privileged directions in the space-time that can be measured experimentally, and thus it can give us hints about a more fundamental theory behind the broken symmetry. This proposal which at first was formulated to be a renormalizable theory as cornerstone, it became known as Standard Model Extension (SME) [6].

Another possibility is to go beyond the SM by relaxing the renormalizability, since we are searching for a more fundamental theory through an effective theory, in a simplest way, by non minimal coupling which violates power-counting renormalizability ($D_\mu = \partial_\mu + ieA_\mu + i\frac{g}{2}\epsilon_{\mu\lambda\alpha\beta}(k_{AF})^\lambda F^{\alpha\beta}$), in an effective the Dirac equation. The proposal of such a non-minimal coupling was suggested by [7] with a Lorentz-violating and CPT-odd nonminimal coupling between fermions and the gauge field, which is carried out by a Carrol-Field-Jackiw (CFJ) term [8]. This proposal has been investigated in several distinct scenarios [9–13].

Connections between high-energy theories and phenomena of condensed matter proved to be very fertile and stimulated the development of new similar mechanism in both areas. The BCS superconductivity is one of the remarkable examples of such links. Nowadays graphene [14, 15], which is described by a 2+1 dimensional massless Dirac equation, is an interesting application for formulation of effective proposals of QED [16, 17]. There is a novel class of materials known as Weyl semi-metals [18], and in these materials an effective low-energy theory is discussed in [19] chosen to take the form of a Lorentz violating version of QED, which generates the non minimal CPT-violating gauge coupling by the fermionic sector. This interesting question that has been the target of research is the possibility of perturbative generating the CFJ term has been addressed in Refs. [20], [21], [22]. Also studies of relativistic quantum effects [23] that stem from a non-minimal coupling with Lorentz symmetry breaking [24] has opened the possibility of investigating new implications in quantum mechanics that this Lorentz-violating background can promote.

One of the main ideas along this line consists in a suggestion that corresponding couplings in a purely gauge (or matter) sector could emerge as a consequence of couplings of these fields with the spinor matter in some underlying model. Proceeding in this way,

the CFJ term has been successfully generated on the base of a minimal Lorentz-breaking extension of the QED [8]. Further, the idea of using the nonminimal couplings as well has been proposed, with the CPT-even aether-like term has been generated within this prescription and showed to be finite on the base of the CPT-odd coupling [25]. However, up to now, the question of use the CPT-even couplings for the perturbative generation of the quantum correction is still open. While such couplings have been proposed already in [7], obtaining of quantum corrections on their base has not been studied enough.

Recently, an interesting example of the nonminimal CPT-even coupling has been proposed in [26] which was shown to be important and interesting within the context of the scattering processes. Therefore, it is natural to study the loop corrections generated by this coupling. Some preliminary studies on this issue have been performed in [27]. However, the natural continuation of the study consists, first, in promoting the study to five dimensions where the theory is one-loop finite, second, in studying of higher-point functions, third, in studying of quantum corrections to vertices of interaction. These problems will be addressed in this paper.

II. THE CPT-EVEN GAUGE THEORY

Let us start with the following action of the extended QED involving the CPT-even term:

$$S = \int d^4x \bar{\psi}(i\partial\!\!\!/ - m - eA\!\!\!/ + \lambda\kappa_{abcd}\sigma^{ab}F^{cd})\psi. \tag{1}$$

This action has been proposed in [26]. It is evidently gauge invariant. Our signature is $(+---)$, and we use $\sigma^{ab} = \frac{i}{2}[\gamma^a, \gamma^b]$.

It is clear that this theory is unfortunately non-renormalizable as well as other theories with nonminimal gauge-matter coupling. In principle, to circumvent this difficulty, we can suggest the gauge field to be purely external, therefore, all quantum corrections are exhausted by the one-loop results, thus, adding appropriate nonlinear terms into the purely gauge sector we avoid all problems with the potential non-renormalizability. However, except of the subsection II.A where such an approach is sufficient to describe the relevant

results, we suggest that we consider the effective theory to study the low-energy behaviour of some underlying fundamental theory, with the non-renormalizability arises for example as a consequence of integration over some extra fields. It is well known that in general, the interpretation of the non-renormalizable theory as an effective one for study of the infrared domain is very natural, the paradigmatic example is the four-fermion interaction. Different issues related to study of quantum aspects of non-renormalizable theories are discussed in papers [28]. Moreover, since the Lorentz symmetry breaking naturally emerges in the low-energy limit of the string theory [29], it is natural to expect that the resulting theory would be non-renormalizable just as occurs for example with the general chiral superfield model arising in the low-energy limit of superstring theory [30]. However, we will argue that the theory can be treated as renormalizable in certain situations.

A. Effective action in a pure gauge sector

In a pure gauge sector, the effective action in our theory is given by the following fermionic determinant:

$$\Gamma^{(1)} = i\mathrm{Tr}(i\partial\!\!\!/ - m - eA\!\!\!/ + \lambda\kappa_{abcd}\sigma^{ab}F^{cd}). \tag{2}$$

Here we suggest the κ_{abcd} to be dimensionless for simplicity, with the dimension of λ is -1. Thus, the theory is non-renormalizable, so we treat it as an effective model for low-energy studies. We start our consideration with a brief review of the results obtained earlier for this theory, that is, one-loop contributions to the two-point function of the gauge field which is represented by the Feynman diagram given by Fig. 1.



FIG. 1: Two-point function of the gauge field.

There will be three different contributions to it: one with two external A^a field, one mixed with one external A^a and one external F^{cd}, and one with two external F^{cd} fields.

As usual we have the Dirac propagator

$$< \psi(k)\bar{\psi}(-k) >= i(\not{k} - m)^{-1}. \tag{3}$$

The case where both of two external legs corresponds to the simple A_a field is well-studied being Lorentz-invariant. It is the well-known two-point function of the gauge field in the usual QED (see f.e. [33]) which yields

$$\Sigma_{QED} = -\frac{e^2}{12\pi^2\epsilon}F_{mn}F^{mn}. \tag{4}$$

The Lorentz-breaking corrections to the two-point function were found in [27]. It was shown there that the diagram with one external A_a and one external F_{cd} looks like, for $d = 4 + \epsilon$,

$$I = -\frac{8}{16\pi^2\epsilon}e\lambda m\kappa_{abcd}F^{ab}F^{cd}. \tag{5}$$

This is the lower-order aether-like contribution. Unfortunately, it diverges. In a particular case it reproduces the aether term found in [25]. Then, the diagram with two external F_{cd} yields [27]

$$J = -4\frac{\lambda^2 m^2}{16\pi^2\epsilon}(\kappa_{abcd}F^{cd})^2. \tag{6}$$

Again, this term is divergent. It is also aether-like. So, in the extended QED involving two couplings, the minimal and nonminimal ones, the aether-like terms naturally emerge both from the purely nonminimal and from the "mixed" sector. These terms are divergent, so, to achieve the renormalizability one should introduce the following free Lagrangian of the gauge field:

$$L_{gauge} = \Gamma_2 = -\frac{1}{4}Z_1F_{ab}F^{ab} + \frac{1}{2}Z_2\kappa^{abcd}F_{ab}F_{cd}, \tag{7}$$

with the renormalization constants are

$$Z_1 = 1 - \frac{e^2}{3\pi^2\epsilon}, \quad Z_2\kappa_{abcd} = \kappa_{abcd} + \frac{e\lambda m}{\pi^2\epsilon}\kappa_{abcd} + \frac{1}{2\pi^2\epsilon}\lambda^2 m^2\kappa_{abmn}\kappa^{mn}{}_{cd}. \tag{8}$$

We note that, in principle, in the five-dimensional case all one-loop contributions are finite within the dimensional regularization. However, here we consider only usual four-dimensional space. Also, if one considers a particular case

$$\kappa_{abcd} = u_au_c\eta_{bd} - u_au_d\eta_{bc} + u_bu_d\eta_{ac} - u_bu_c\eta_{ad}, \tag{9}$$

with u_a is a dimensionless constant vector, which implies that $\kappa_{abcd}F^{ab}F^{cd} = 4u^a F_{ab}u_c F^{cb}$, thus reproducing perfectly the aether term studied in [25, 32], one finds that $\kappa_{abcd}\kappa^{cdmn} = 2u^2\kappa_{ab}{}^{cd}$, so, one arrives at

$$Z_2 = 1 + \frac{e\lambda m + u^2\lambda^2 m^2}{\pi^2\epsilon}. \tag{10}$$

One can observe that the quantum corrections with divergence higher than the logarithmic one are proportional to different positive degrees of the mass since the mass is the only parameter with positive dimension in our theory. Therefore, one naturally concludes that for in the massless limit, the quadratically divergent correction in our theory will vanish. Actually, it means that in this limit the only divergence is that one of the four-point function of the gauge field.

There is one more divergence in four dimensions which has not ever considered. It is given by the four-point function. It is well known that the purely minimal contribution to the four-point function is zero, by the gauge invariance reasons. Actually, since the trace of the product of three F_{mn} tensors is zero (and of three $\tilde{F}_{ab} = \kappa^{abcd}F_{cd}$ tensors as well, also by symmetry reasons, so, we note that for diagrams composed by purely nonminimal couplings there is a kind of Furry theorem, that is, the one-loop diagrams involving only $\tilde{F}$ legs and odd number of vertices identically vanishes), and forming of the F_{mn} on the base of the external A_m decreases the degree of divergence by one, we see that the only possible divergent contribution to this function consistent with the gauge invariance is purely non-minimal one, that is, involving namely four non-minimal vertices (with all gauge-invariant one-loop four-leg diagrams with at least one minimal vertex will be finite), and given by the expression

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma_4 \;=\; & -\frac{1}{4}\int \frac{d^4k}{(2\pi)^4}\frac{1}{(k^2-m^2)^4}\mathrm{tr}[\sigma^{ab}(\not{k}+m)\sigma^{cd}(\not{k}+m)\sigma^{mn}(\not{k}+m)\sigma^{pq}(\not{k}+m)]\times \\ & \times\; \tilde{F}_{ab}\tilde{F}_{cd}\tilde{F}_{mn}\tilde{F}_{pq}.\end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

Actually, to obtain the divergence only, we must calculate the leading term from Γ_4 which looks like

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma_4 \;=\; & -\frac{1}{4}\tilde{F}_{ab}\tilde{F}_{cd}\tilde{F}_{mn}\tilde{F}_{pq}\int \frac{d^4k}{(2\pi)^4}\frac{k_\mu k_\nu k_\lambda k_\rho}{(k^2-m^2)^4}\times \\ & \times\; \mathrm{tr}[\sigma^{ab}\gamma^\mu\sigma^{cd}\gamma^\nu\sigma^{mn}\gamma^\lambda\sigma^{pq}\gamma^\rho].\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

Then, it is well known that

$$\int \frac{d^4k}{(2\pi)^4}\frac{k_\mu k_\nu k_\lambda k_\rho}{(k^2-m^2)^4} = \frac{1}{3}\frac{1}{16\pi^2\epsilon}(\eta_{\mu\nu}\eta_{\lambda\rho}+\eta_{\mu\lambda}\eta_{\nu\rho}+\eta_{\mu\rho}\eta_{\nu\lambda}), \tag{13}$$

and that $\gamma^\mu\sigma^{ab}\gamma_\mu = 0$ in four dimensions. Taking into account all this, we find that only one term contributes to the trace:

$$\Gamma_4 \;=\; -\frac{1}{192\pi^2\epsilon}\tilde{F}_{ab}\tilde{F}_{cd}\tilde{F}_{mn}\tilde{F}_{pq}\mathrm{tr}[\sigma^{ab}\gamma^\mu\sigma^{cd}\gamma^\nu\sigma^{mn}\gamma_\mu\sigma^{pq}\gamma_\nu]. \tag{14}$$

It remains to find this trace. Straightforward calculation yields, if again $\epsilon = d-4$,

$$\Gamma_4 = -\frac{1}{4\pi^2\epsilon}(-\frac{2}{3}(\tilde{F}_{ab}\tilde{F}^{ab})^2+\frac{8}{3}\tilde{F}_{ab}\tilde{F}^{bc}\tilde{F}_{cd}\tilde{F}^{da})+\mathrm{fin}, \tag{15}$$

which diverges as it must be. We note that this result is proportional to fourth order in κ_{abcd}. In principle, considering this expression together with higher-leg one-loop finite contributions one can arrive at some Lorentz-breaking generalization of the Heisenberg-Euler effective action. Moreover, it is easy to check that for the light-like u^a, (15) vanishes.

B. The one-loop two-point function of the spinor field

If we abandon the restriction that the gauge field is purely external, we should, as it has been suggested in [27], consider the lower corrections to the two-point function of the spinor field and to the vertex function. One can easily verify that if we have only one non-minimal vertex with κ_{abcd} given by (9), the one-derivative contribution to the two-point function of the spinor field will be purely Lorentz invariant, equal to $-\frac{e\lambda u^2}{4\pi^2\epsilon}\bar{\psi}(-p)(-3m\not{p}+2m^2)\psi(p)$, So, let us consider the Feynman diagram formed by two nonminimal vertices. It is given by Fig. 2.



FIG. 2: Two-point function of the spinor field.

We suggest that we use the Feynman gauge, so, the propagator of the gauge field is

$$< A^c(k)A^d(-k) >= i\frac{\eta^{cd}}{k^2}. \tag{16}$$

Then, one should take into account acting of the derivatives on the gauge fields in the vertices. The resulting contribution is

$$\Gamma_{\bar\psi\psi} = \frac{\lambda^2}{2}\kappa_{abcd}\kappa_{a'b'c'd'}\int d^4x\bar\psi\sigma^{ab} < F^{cd}F^{c'd'} > \sigma^{a'b'} < \psi\bar\psi > \psi. \tag{17}$$

After the Fourier transform, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma_{\bar\psi\psi} &= \frac{\lambda^2}{2}\kappa_{abcd}\kappa_{a'b'c'd'}\int\frac{d^dk}{(2\pi)^d}\frac{1}{[(k+p)^2-m^2]k^2}\bar\psi(-p)\sigma^{ab}(\not k+\not p+m)\sigma^{a'b'}\times\\ &\times\Big[k^ck^{c'}\eta^{dd'}+k^dk^{d'}\eta^{cc'}-k^ck^{d'}\eta^{c'd}-k^dk^{c'}\eta^{cd'}\Big]\psi(p).\end{aligned}\tag{18}$$

It remains to find the integral. Keeping only the first order in the external momentum p to get the generalization of the Dirac action, after simple changes of variables through Feynman representation, and taking into account the symmetries of the κ coefficients, we find:

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma_{\bar\psi\psi} &= \frac{\lambda^2}{2}\frac{4}{d}\kappa_{abcd}\kappa_{a'b'c'd'}\times\\ &\times\int_0^1dx\int\frac{d^dk}{(2\pi)^d}\frac{k^2}{(k^2-m^2x)^2}\Big[\bar\psi(-p)\sigma^{ab}[\not p(1-x)+m]\sigma^{a'b'}\psi(p)\eta^{cc'}\eta^{dd'}-\\ &-\bar\psi(-p)\sigma^{ab}\gamma^m\sigma^{a'b'}\psi(p)(\delta^{c'}_mp^c+\delta^c_mp^{c'})\eta^{dd'}\Big].\end{aligned}\tag{19}$$

After integration over momenta, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma_{\bar\psi\psi} &= -\lambda^2\frac{(m^2)^{d/2-1}}{(4\pi)^{d/2}}\Gamma(1-\frac{d}{2})\kappa_{abcd}\kappa_{a'b'c'd'}\times\\ &\times\int_0^1dxx^{d/2-1}\Big[\bar\psi(-p)\sigma^{ab}[\not p(1-x)+m]\sigma^{a'b'}\psi(p)\eta^{cc'}\eta^{dd'}-\\ &-\bar\psi(-p)\sigma^{ab}\gamma^m\sigma^{a'b'}\psi(p)(\delta^{c'}_mp^c+\delta^c_mp^{c'})\eta^{dd'}\Big].\end{aligned}\tag{20}$$

This expression yields at $d=4+\epsilon$:

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma_{\bar\psi\psi} &= -\frac{\lambda^2m^2}{16\pi^2\epsilon}\kappa_{abcd}\kappa_{a'b'c'}{}^d\Big[\bar\psi(-p)\sigma^{ab}[\frac{1}{3}\not p+m]\sigma^{a'b'}\psi(p)\eta^{cc'}-\\ &-\bar\psi(-p)\sigma^{ab}\gamma^m\sigma^{a'b'}\psi(p)(\delta^{c'}_mp^c+\delta^c_mp^{c'})\Big]+\text{fin}.\end{aligned}\tag{21}$$

It is easy to see that this term vanishes in a massless theory. Also, for κ_{abcd} given by (9), we find

$$\Gamma_{\bar\psi\psi} = \frac{\lambda^2m^2}{16\pi^2\epsilon}\Big[8u^2u_au_{a'}\bar\psi(-p)\sigma^{ab}[\frac{1}{3}\not p+m]\sigma^{a'}{}_b\psi(p)-\tag{22}$$

$$- \; 4u_a u_{a'} u_c u_{c'} \bar{\psi}(-p)\sigma^{ab}\gamma^m \sigma^{a'}{}_b \psi(p)(\delta^{c'}_m p^c + \delta^c_m p^{c'}) -$$
$$- \; 4u^2 u_a u_{a'} \bar{\psi}(-p)\sigma^a{}_c \gamma^m \sigma^{a'}{}_{c'} \psi(p)(\delta^{c'}_m p^c + \delta^c_m p^{c'})\Big] + \text{fin.}$$

It can be simplified even more. We use the fact that

$$\sigma^{ab}\gamma^m \sigma^{a'}{}_b = -2\gamma^a \eta^{ma'} - 2\gamma^{a'}\eta^{ma} + \gamma^m \gamma^a \gamma^{a'}. \tag{23}$$

As a result we get

$$\Gamma_{\bar{\psi}\psi} \; = \; \frac{\lambda^2 m^2 u^2}{6\pi^2 \epsilon} \bar{\psi}(-p)\Big[25u^2 \not{p} + 9u^2 m - 10 \not{u}(u\cdot p)\Big]\psi(p) + \text{fin.} \tag{24}$$

We find that besides of the Lorentz-invariant terms we get just the term $\bar{\psi}(-p)\not{u}(u\cdot p)\psi(p)$ originally proposed in [32] as the aether term for the spinor field. Thus, namely (24) includes the lowest aether-like contribution for the spinor field, so, our Lorentz-breaking result is valid both in the presence of the minimal vertex and in its absence. Moreover, it vanishes for the light-like u^a.

C. The one-loop three-point vertex function

Now, we can find the three-point vertex function in the theory which evidently displays the quadratic divergence. It is given by the Feynman diagram:



FIG. 3: Three-point function.

Following the prescriptions of the derivative expansion, it is natural to restrict ourselves only by the contributions of first order in derivatives, like our triple vertex $\lambda\kappa_{abcd}\bar{\psi}\sigma^{ab}F^{cd}\psi$.

We start with considering the Feynman diagram of first order in λ, we will have two situations. First, let the nonminimal vertex is associated with external gauge leg. In this

case, it yields

$$\Gamma_1 = \frac{\lambda e^2}{2}\int \frac{d^4k}{(2\pi)^4}\bar{\psi}\frac{\gamma^m(\not{k}+m)\sigma^{ab}(\not{k}+m)\gamma^n}{(k^2-m^2)^2}\psi\frac{\eta_{mn}}{k^2}\tilde{F}_{ab}, \tag{25}$$

where the internal momenta are suppressed being irrelevant within our approximation. By symmetry reasons, there are two nontrivial contributions in the numerator: one of zero order in momenta, $m^2\gamma^m\sigma^{ab}\gamma_m$, which vanishes since $\gamma^m\sigma^{ab}\gamma_m = 0$ in four dimensions, and another of second order in momenta, $\gamma^m\not{k}\sigma^{ab}\not{k}\gamma_m$. However, using the definition of $\not{k}$, one can easily rewrite this factor as $k_pk_q\gamma^m\gamma^p\sigma^{ab}\gamma^q\gamma_m$, and under the integral one can replace $k_pk_q \to \frac{1}{4}\eta_{pq}k^2$, which allows to write our factor as $\frac{k^2}{4}\gamma^m\gamma^p\sigma^{ab}\gamma_p\gamma_m = 0$. So, in this case the three-point function yields a zero result.

Now we consider the case when the only nonminimal vertex is associated to the external spinor leg. The corresponding contribution is, for $p = -p_1 - p_2$, with two terms correspond to two choices of a position of the nonminimal vertex:

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma_3^{(1)} &= \frac{1}{2}\lambda e^2\kappa^{nlab}\int\frac{d^4k}{(2\pi)^4}\frac{(k_l-p_{1l})}{(k^2-m^2)(k-p_1)^2[(k+p)^2-m^2]}\times\\ &\times\ \bar{\psi}(p_1)\Big[\gamma^m(\not{k}+m)\gamma^r(\not{k}+\not{p}+m)\sigma_{ab} -\\ &-\ \sigma_{ab}(\not{k}+m)\gamma^r(\not{k}+\not{p}+m)\gamma^m\Big]\psi(p_2)\eta_{mn}A_r(p) + (p_1\leftrightarrow p_2).\end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

Here we introduced two terms with interchange between p_1 and p_2 since, after the substitution into the effective action, the integration over both these momenta should be done. Actually, we want to find only the divergence of this expression. It is clear thus that the terms proportional to m^2 in the numerator will be irrelevant due to their finiteness. Also, the desired expression will involve the even number of Dirac matrices because of structure of contractions (actually, we look for the structure like $\bar{\psi}\sigma^{ma}\psi F_{ab}u_mu^b$, that is, the lower Lorentz-breaking gauge invariant contribution involving two u^m vectors). Thus, (26) is reduced to

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma_3^{(1)} &= \frac{\lambda e^2}{2}\kappa^{nlab}\int\frac{d^4k}{(2\pi)^4}\frac{(k_l-p_{1l})}{(k^2-m^2)(k-p_1)^2[(k+p)^2-m^2]}\times\\ &\times\ \bar{\psi}(p_1)\Big[\gamma_n\not{k}\gamma^r(\not{k}+\not{p})\sigma_{ab} - \sigma_{ab}\not{k}\gamma^r(\not{k}+\not{p})\gamma_n\Big]\psi(p_2)A_r(p) + (p_1\leftrightarrow p_2).\end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

The straightforward calculations show that the relevant result is

$$\Gamma_3^{(1)} = \frac{1}{4\pi^2\epsilon}\lambda e^2\bar{\psi}\sigma^{ma}\psi F_{ab}u_mu^b + \frac{e^2\lambda m}{2\pi^2\epsilon}\bar{\psi}[(A\cdot u)\not{u} + \frac{1}{2}\not{A}u^2]\psi + \text{fin}. \tag{28}$$

Treating the one-loop corrections to the three-point function with more insertions of nonminimal vertices, we easily find that they will be either finite involving larger numbers of derivatives applied to external gauge leg, or involving the contractions like $(u^2)^n$ which vanish for the light-like u^m. We note that the first contribution to this term, being proportional to $\bar{\psi}\sigma^{ma}\psi F_{ab}u_m u^b$, perfectly reproduces the structure of the nonminimal vertex of our action, $\kappa^{abcd}\bar{\psi}\sigma^{ab}\psi F_{cd}$, for the κ_{abcd} given by (9), whereas the second one involves an A_m-dependent part of the aether-extended Dirac Lagrangian [32] $i\bar{\psi}u^m u^n\gamma_m D_n\psi$.

The case when two vertices are nonminimal is given by two graphs. In one of them, the external gauge leg is attached to the minimal vertex. The contribution of this graph is

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma^{(2)}_{3a} &= \frac{e\lambda^2}{2}\kappa_{aba'b'}\kappa_{efe'f'}\int\frac{d^dp_1d^dp_2}{(2\pi)^{2d}}A_m(-p_1-p_2)\times\\ &\times\int\frac{d^dk}{(2\pi)^d}\bar{\psi}(p_1)\sigma^{a'b'}(\not{k}+m)\gamma^m(\not{k}-\not{p}_1-\not{p}_2+m)\sigma^{e'f'}\psi(p_2)\times\\ &\times\frac{1}{(k^2-m^2)[(k-p_1-p_2)^2-m^2](k-p_1)^2}\times\\ &\times[(k-p_1)^a(k-p_1)^e\eta^{bf}+(k-p_1)^b(k-p_1)^f\eta^{ae}-\\ &-(k-p_1)^a(k-p_1)^f\eta^{be}-(k-p_1)^b(k-p_1)^e\eta^{af}]+(p_1\leftrightarrow p_2).\end{aligned}\tag{29}$$

The exact result is very cumbersome, so we give only its form at $u^2=0$ it yields

$$\Gamma^{(2)}_{3a} = \frac{e\lambda^2}{3\pi^2\epsilon}\Big[(u\cdot\partial)^2\bar{\psi}u^aA_a\not{u}\psi+\bar{\psi}u^aA_a\not{u}(u\cdot\partial)^2\psi-(u\cdot\partial)\psi u^aA_a(u\cdot\partial)\not{u}\psi\Big].\tag{30}$$

However, this result is of the second order in derivatives and thus irrelevant in our approximation.

In another case, the external gauge leg is nonminimal:

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma^{(2)}_{3b} &= \frac{1}{2}\lambda e^2\kappa^{nlab}\int\frac{d^4k}{(2\pi)^4}\frac{(k_l-p_{1l})}{(k^2-m^2)(k-p_1)^2[(k+p)^2-m^2]}\times\\ &\times\bar{\psi}(p_1)\Big[\gamma^m(\not{k}+m)\sigma^{rs}(\not{k}+\not{p}+m)\sigma_{ab}-\\ &-\sigma_{ab}(\not{k}+m)\sigma^{rs}(\not{k}+\not{p}+m)\gamma^m\Big]\psi(p_2)\eta_{mn}\tilde{F}_{rs}(p)+(p_1\leftrightarrow p_2).\end{aligned}\tag{31}$$

Since in this case it is sufficient to disregard momenta p_1, p_2 in internal lines, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma^{(2)}_{3b} &= \frac{1}{2}\lambda e^2\kappa^{nlab}\int\frac{d^dk}{(2\pi)^d}\frac{k_l}{(k^2-m^2)^2k^2}\times\\ &\times\bar{\psi}(p_1)\Big[\gamma^m(\not{k}-m)\sigma^{rs}(\not{k}-m)\sigma_{ab}-\sigma_{ab}(\not{k}-m)\sigma^{rs}(\not{k}-m)\gamma^m\Big]\psi(p_2)\eta_{mn}\tilde{F}_{rs}(p)+\\ &+(p_1\leftrightarrow p_2).\end{aligned}\tag{32}$$

The result is

$$\Gamma^{(2)}_{3b} \;=\; -\frac{\lambda e^2}{2\pi^2\epsilon}\Big[\partial^b\bar\psi u^a\tilde F_{ab}\not u\psi+\bar\psi u^a\tilde F_{ab}\not u\partial^b\psi+2m\bar\psi u^a\tilde F_{ra}\not u\gamma^r\psi\Big]. \tag{33}$$

Also, we can integrate by parts to obtain

$$\Gamma^{(2)}_{3b} \;=\; -\frac{\lambda e^2}{2\pi^2\epsilon}\Big[-\bar\psi\not u\psi u^a\partial^b\tilde F_{ab}+2m\bar\psi u^a\tilde F_{ra}\not u\gamma^r\psi\Big]. \tag{34}$$

We note that $u^a\tilde F_{ab}=0$ if $u^au_a=0$, so, for the light-like u_a this expression completely vanishes (moreover, its first term is irrelevant since does not contribute to the first order of the derivative expansion).

Also, as an illustration, let us consider the case when all three vertices are nonminimal. The contribution of this graph is

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma^{(3)}_3 \;=\;& \frac{\lambda^3}{2}\kappa_{aba'b'}\kappa_{efe'f'}\int\frac{d^dp_1d^dp_2}{(2\pi)^{2d}}\tilde F_{cd}(-p_1-p_2)\times\\
&\times\int\frac{d^dk}{(2\pi)^d}\bar\psi(p_1)\sigma^{a'b'}(\not k+m)\sigma^{cd}(\not k-\not p_1-\not p_2+m)\sigma^{e'f'}\psi(p_2)\times\\
&\times\frac{1}{(k^2-m^2)[(k-p_1-p_2)^2-m^2](k-p_1)^2}\times\\
&\times[(k-p_1)^a(k-p_1)^e\eta^{bf}+(k-p_1)^b(k-p_1)^f\eta^{ae}-\\
&-(k-p_1)^a(k-p_1)^f\eta^{be}-(k-p_1)^b(k-p_1)^e\eta^{af}].\end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

Since our aim consists in obtaining only of a (divergent) correction to the vertex, with no more derivatives acting on any of the external fields, we can put $p_1,p_2\simeq 0$ within this integral, and do the inverse Fourier transform. We get

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma^{(3)}_3 \;=\;& \frac{\lambda^3}{2}\kappa_{aba'b'}\kappa_{efe'f'}\int d^dx\tilde F_{cd}(x)\times\\
&\times\int\frac{d^dk}{(2\pi)^d}\bar\psi(x)\sigma^{a'b'}(\not k+m)\sigma^{cd}(\not k+m)\sigma^{e'f'}\psi(x)\times\\
&\times\frac{1}{(k^2-m^2)^2k^2}[k^ak^e\eta^{bf}+k^bk^f\eta^{ae}-k^ak^f\eta^{be}-k^bk^e\eta^{af}].\end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

We can rewrite this term as a sum:

$$\Gamma^{(3)}_3=\Gamma_{31}+\Gamma_{32}, \tag{37}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\Gamma_{31} &= \frac{\lambda^3}{2}\kappa_{aba'b'}\kappa_{efe'f'}\int d^dx\tilde{F}_{cd}(x)\times \\
&\times\ \bar{\psi}(x)\sigma^{a'b'}\gamma^\mu\sigma^{cd}\gamma^\nu\sigma^{e'f'}\psi(x)\times \\
&\times\ \int\frac{d^dk}{(2\pi)^d}\frac{k_\mu k_\nu}{(k^2-m^2)^2k^2}[k^ak^e\eta^{bf}+k^bk^f\eta^{ae}-k^ak^f\eta^{be}-k^bk^e\eta^{af}]; \\
\Gamma_{32} &= \frac{m^2\lambda^3}{2}\kappa_{aba'b'}\kappa_{efe'f'}\int d^dx\tilde{F}_{cd}(x)\times \\
&\times\ \bar{\psi}(x)\sigma^{a'b'}\sigma^{cd}\sigma^{e'f'}\psi(x)\times \\
&\times\ \int\frac{d^dk}{(2\pi)^d}\frac{1}{(k^2-m^2)^2k^2}[k^ak^e\eta^{bf}+k^bk^f\eta^{ae}-k^ak^f\eta^{be}-k^bk^e\eta^{af}]. \qquad (38)
\end{aligned}$$

To find the integral, we carry out the following replacement in d dimensions:

$$\begin{aligned}
k_ak_b &= \frac{1}{d}\eta_{ab}k^2 \\
k_ak_bk_ck_d &= \frac{1}{3d^2}(\eta_{ab}\eta_{cd}+\eta_{ac}\eta_{bd}+\eta_{ad}\eta_{bc})k^4. \qquad (39)
\end{aligned}$$

As a result, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\Gamma_{31} &= \frac{\lambda^3}{6d^2}\kappa_{aba'b'}\kappa_{efe'f'}\int d^dx\tilde{F}_{cd}(x)\times \\
&\times\ \bar{\psi}(x)\sigma^{a'b'}\gamma_\mu\sigma^{cd}\gamma_\nu\sigma^{e'f'}\psi(x)\int\frac{d^dk}{(2\pi)^d}\frac{k^2}{(k^2-m^2)^2}\times \\
&\times\ [\eta^{bf}(\eta^{\mu\nu}\eta^{ae}+\eta^{\mu a}\eta^{\nu e}+\eta^{\mu e}\eta^{\nu a})+\eta^{ae}(\eta^{\mu\nu}\eta^{bf}+\eta^{\mu b}\eta^{\nu f}+\eta^{\mu f}\eta^{\nu b})- \\
&-\ \eta^{af}(\eta^{\mu\nu}\eta^{be}+\eta^{\mu b}\eta^{\nu e}+\eta^{\mu e}\eta^{\nu b})-\eta^{be}(\eta^{\mu\nu}\eta^{af}+\eta^{\mu a}\eta^{\nu f}+\eta^{\mu f}\eta^{\nu a})]; \\
\Gamma_{32} &= \frac{m^2\lambda^3}{d}\kappa_{aba'b'}\kappa_{efe'f'}\int d^dx\tilde{F}_{cd}(x)\bar{\psi}(x)\sigma^{a'b'}\sigma^{cd}\sigma^{e'f'}\psi(x)\times \\
&\times\ \int\frac{d^dk}{(2\pi)^d}\frac{1}{(k^2-m^2)^2}[\eta^{ae}\eta^{bf}-\eta^{af}\eta^{be}]. \qquad (40)
\end{aligned}$$

We can integrate, which yields in $d=4+\epsilon$ dimensions, with taking into account the fact that $\gamma^\mu\sigma^{ab}\gamma_\mu=0$, second, the symmetric properties of the κ_{abef}:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Gamma_{31} &= -\frac{m^2\lambda^3}{384\pi^2\epsilon}\kappa_{aba'b'}\kappa_{efe'f'}\int d^4x\tilde{F}_{cd}(x)\times \\
&\times\ \bar{\psi}(x)\sigma^{a'b'}\gamma_\mu\sigma^{cd}\gamma_\nu\sigma^{e'f'}\psi(x).\eta^{bf}[\eta^{\mu a}\eta^{\nu e}+\eta^{\mu e}\eta^{\nu a}]; \\
\Gamma_{32} &= -\frac{m^2\lambda^3}{64\pi^2\epsilon}\kappa_{aba'b'}\kappa_{efe'f'}\int d^4x\tilde{F}_{cd}(x)\bar{\psi}(x)\sigma^{a'b'}\sigma^{cd}\sigma^{e'f'}\psi(x)\times \\
&\times\ [\eta^{ae}\eta^{bf}-\eta^{af}\eta^{be}]. \qquad (41)
\end{aligned}$$

Simplifying these expressions even more for κ_{abcd} given by (9), we get

$$\Gamma_{31} = -\frac{m^2\lambda^3u^2}{48\pi^2\epsilon}\int d^4x\bar{\psi}(x)(-10u^2\sigma^{cd}-12(\sigma^{dm}u^cu_m-\sigma^{cm}u^du_m))\tilde{F}_{cd}(x)\psi(x);$$
$$\Gamma_{32} = \frac{m^2\lambda^3u^4}{64\pi^2\epsilon}\int d^4x\bar{\psi}(x)\sigma^{cd}\tilde{F}_{cd}(x)\psi(x). \quad (42)$$

Thus, we found the result or the triple vertex explicitly. It vanishes for the light-like u_a. Moreover, the essentially Lorentz-breaking contribution to this vertex is

$$\Gamma^{(3)}_{3,LV} = \frac{m^2\lambda^3u^2}{4\pi^2\epsilon}\int d^4x\bar{\psi}(x)(\sigma^{dm}u^cu_m-\sigma^{cm}u^du_m)\tilde{F}_{cd}(x)\psi(x) \quad (43)$$

We see that this expression, first, does not involve derivatives of F_{mn}, second, vanishes at $u^2=0$.

We conclude that for the light-like u^a, the only relevant (that is, involving only first order in derivatives) result for the three-point function is given by (28) which in the massless limit yields

$$\Gamma_3 = \frac{1}{4\pi^2\epsilon}\lambda e^2\bar{\psi}\sigma^{ma}\psi F_{ab}u_mu^b + \text{fin}. \quad (44)$$

So, in this way we have been carried out the calculations of an effective nonminimally coupling Dirac equation and, by radiative corrections we have generated a new way to obtain the CPT-even term of the SME gauge sector. The expressions of lowest order graphs (self-energy and the three vertex-like contributions) have been obtained. As in four-dimensional space-time the theory presents divergent terms we infer that the model presents a low-energy domain.

III. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we succeeded to generate the SME sector gauge starting from an effective fermionic theory with non-minimal coupling. While, earlier [27] the CPT-even term of the SME electrodynamics $(K_F)_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}F^{\mu\nu}F^{\rho\sigma}$ was generated in this model, now we have calculated explicitly the lower corrections to the two-point function of the spinor field and the three-point vertex function.

It turns out to be that, as a result, the aether-like terms naturally arise not only in the pure gauge sector, but also in the matter sector, with the lower aether-like contribution in the spinor sector is generated by the diagram with two nonminimal vertices. Unfortunately, in four-dimensional space-time all these results are divergent unlike those ones obtained on the base of the CPT-odd coupling [25]. However, the presence of these divergences, from one side, can signalize the presence of the corresponding terms in a complete action of the electromagnetic field, or, if we treat the Lorentz-breaking theory as an effective field theory aimed for study of the low-energy domain, instead of the divergences we can have the aether-like contributions depending on the cutoff.

It is interesting to discuss the renormalizability of our theory. Although the theory is formally non-renormalizable, we note the following facts. First, if we consider the massless limit, the quadratic and linear divergences evidently vanish within the dimensional regularization framework (indeed, the corresponding loop integrals are proportional to a positive degree of the mass, like $\int \frac{d^{4+\epsilon}k}{(2\pi)^{4+\epsilon}} \frac{1}{k^2+m^2} = -\frac{m^2}{16\pi^2\epsilon}$). Second, if we consider the light-like Lorentz-breaking vector u^a, many of quantum corrections simply vanish as occurs in all cases considered by us with corrections of second and higher orders in κ_{abcd} (actually it means that only one vector u^a can be contracted with a Dirac matrix, otherwise, using the commutation relations, one can obtain $u^a u^b \gamma_a \gamma_b = u^2$ which vanishes for the light-like u_a; within this paper we observed for many one-loop examples that if a Feynman diagram involves at least two nonminimal vertices, its contribution will be proportional to u^2 and thus vanishes for the light-like u_a, and it is natural to expect that the similar situation will occur in higher loops). Third, if we have two or more insertions of κ_{abcd}, in principle, after integration by parts, in principle we can arrive at terms like $\bar{\psi}\sigma^{ab}\psi(u\cdot\partial)^{2n}F_{bc}u_a u^c$, but if we suggest that the background fields satisfy the condition $\partial_a F_{bc} = 0$ (i.e. constant electric or magnetic fields), these results vanish. As a result, we conclude that under our restrictions the only divergences in the theory are namely the corrections to kinetic terms and the triple vertex obtained by us, so, the theory apparently becomes all-loop renormalizable. In five dimensions, from the other side, the desired aether-like terms will be one-loop finite within the dimensional regularization framework.

Also, one can notice that the higher-point functions of the gauge field can give origin

to the effect of the photon splitting [34], or to the generalized Heisenberg-Euler effective action of the nonlinear electrodynamics.

Acknowledgements. Authors are grateful to R. Casana, M. M. Ferreira and F. E. P. dos Santos for important discussions. This work was partially supported by Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico (CNPq). The work by A. Yu. P. has been supported by the CNPq project No. 303783/2015-0.

---

[1] S. F. Novaes, Particle and Fields, Proceedings of the X J. A. Swieca Summer School (World Scientific, Singapore, 2000), hep-ph/0001283.

[2] W. Bernreuther and M. Suzuki, Rev. Mod. Phys. 63, 313 (1991).

[3] J. Baron et al., Science 343, 269 (2014).

[4] V. A. Kostelecký and S. Samuel, Phys. Rev. D **39**, 683 (1989).

[5] H. Belich, T. Costa-Soares, M. A. Santos and M. T. D. Orlando, Rev. Bras. Ens. Fís. **29**, 1 (2007).

[6] D. Colladay, V. A. Kostelecky, Phys. Rev. D55, 6760 (1997), hep-ph/9703464; Phys. Rev. D58, 116002 1998), hep-ph/9809521.

[7] H. Belich, T. Costa-Soares, M. M. Ferreira Jr., J.A. Helayel-Neto, Eur. Phys. J. C **41**, 421-426, (2005), hep-th/0410104.

[8] S. Carroll, G. Field, R. Jackiw, Phys. Rev. D **41**, 1231 (1990).

[9] H. Belich, L. P. Colatto, T. Costa-Soares, J. A. Helayël-Neto, M. T. D. Orlando, Eur. Phys. J. C **62**, 425 (2009), arXiv: 0806.1253.

[10] B. Charneski, M. Gomes, R. V. Maluf, A. J. da Silva, Phys. Rev. D **86**, 045003 (2012), arXiv: 1204.0755.

[11] L. R. Ribeiro, E. Passos, C. Furtado, J. Phys. G. **39**, 105004 (2012), arXiv: 1105.1401.

[12] K. Bakke, H. Belich, J. Phys. G **39**, 085001 (2012), arXiv: 1206.2249; K. Bakke, H. Belich, E. O. Silva, J. Math. Phys. **52**, 063505 (2011), arXiv: 1106.2324; J. Phys. G **39**, 055004 (2012), arXiv: 1203.3407; Ann. Phys. (Leipzig) **523**, 910 (2011); K. Bakke and H. Belich, Eur. Phys. J. Plus **127**, 102 (2012), arXiv: 1208.6482.

[13] H. Belich, E. O. Silva, M. M. Ferreira Jr., and M. T. D. Orlando, Phys. Rev. D **83**, 125025 (2011), arXiv: 1106.0789.

[14] G. W. Semenoff, Phys. Rev. Lett. 53, 2449 (1984).

[15] M. Vozmediano, M. Katsnelson, and F. Guinea, Phys. Rep. 496, 109 (2010).

[16] E. C. Marino, L. O. Nascimento, Van Sérgio Alves, and C. Morais Smith, Phys. Rev. D **90**, 105003 (2014), arXiv: 1408.1637.

[17] E. C. Marino, L. O. Nascimento, Van Sérgio Alves, and C. Morais Smith, Phys. Rev. X **5**, 011040 (2015), arXiv: 1503.08347.

[18] A. A. Burkov, M. D. Hook, and L. Balents, Phys. Rev. B, **84**, 235126 (2011).

[19] A. G. Grushin, Phys. Rev. D **86**, 045001 (2012), arXiv: 1205.3722.

[20] R. Jackiw and V. A. Kostelecky, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 3572 (1999), hep-ph/9901358; M. Perez-Victoria, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 2518 (1999), hep-th/9905161; J. M. Chung, Phys. Rev. D **60**, 127901 (1999), hep-th/9904037; J. M. Chung and B. K. Chung, Phys. Rev. D **63**, 105015 (2001), hep-th/0101097; G. Bonneau, Nucl. Phys. B **593**, 398 (2001); M. Perez-Victoria, JHEP 0104, 032 (2001), hep-th/0102021.

[21] O. A. Battistel and G. Dallabona, Nucl. Phys. B **610**, 316 (2001), hep-th/0012181; J. Phys. G **27**, L53 (2001); J. Phys. G **28**, L23 (2002), hep-th/0208084; A. P. B. Scarpelli, M. Sampaio, M. C. Nemes, and B. Hiller, Phys. Rev. D **64**, 046013 (2001), hep-th/0102108; T. Mariz, J. R. Nascimento, E. Passos, R. F. Ribeiro and F. A. Brito, JHEP 0510 (2005) 019, hep-th/0509008; J. R. Nascimento, E. Passos, A. Yu. Petrov, F. A. Brito, JHEP 0706, 016 (2007), arXiv: 0705.1338; B. Altschul, Phys. Rev. D **70**, 101701 (2004), hep-th/0407172; A. P. B. Scarpelli, M. Sampaio, M. C. Nemes, B. Hiller, Eur. Phys. J. C **56**, 571 (2008), arXiv: 0804.3537; F.A. Brito, J.R. Nascimento, E. Passos, A. Yu. Petrov, Phys. Lett. B **664**, 112 (2008), arXiv: 0709.3090; O. M. Del Cima, J. M. Fonseca, D. H. T. Franco, O. Piguet, Phys. Lett. B **688**, 258 (2010), arXiv: 0912.4392.

[22] F. A. Brito, L. S. Grigorio, M. S. Guimaraes, E. Passos, C. Wotzasek, Phys. Rev. D **78**, 125023 (2008), arXiv: 0810.3180; Phys. Lett. B **681**,495 (2009), arXiv: 0906.2786; F. A. Brito, E. Passos, P. V. Santos, Europhys. Lett. **95**, 51001 (2011), arXiv: 1101.5390; J. Leite and T. Mariz, Eur. Phys. Lett. **99**, 21003 (2012), arXiv: 1110.2127.

[23] K. Bakke and C. Furtado, Phys. Rev. D **80**, 024033 (2009); K. Bakke and C. Furtado, Phys. Lett. A **375**, 3956 (2011); K. Bakke and C. Furtado, Quantum Inf. Comput. **11**, 444 (2011); K. Bakke, A. Yu. Petrov, C. Furtado, Annals Phys. 327, 2946 (2012), arXiv: 1111.0836; K. Bakke and C. Furtado, Ann. Phys. (NY) **327**, 376 (2012); K. Bakke and C. Furtado, Quantum Inf. Process. **12**, 119 (2013); H. F. Mota, K. Bakke, Phys. Rev. D **89**, 027702 (2014), arXiv: 1401.3728.

[24] K. Bakke and H. Belich, Annalen der Physik (Leipzig) **526**, 187 (2014); A. G. Lima, H. Belich, K. Bakke, Eur. Phys. J. Plus, **128**, 154 (2013), K. Bakke, H. Belich, J. Phys. G, **40**, 065002 (2013), arXiv: 1304.4833; K. Bakke, H. Belich, Ann. Phys. (NY), **333**, 272 (2013), arXiv: 1304.4830; A. G. de Lima, H. Belich and K. Bakke, Ann. Phys. (Leipzig), **526**, 514 (2014); H. Belich, K. Bakke, Phys. Rev. D, **90**, 025026 (2014), arXiv: 1407.6279; K. Bakke, H. Belich, Eur. Phys. J. Plus, **129**, 147 (2014); H. Belich, K. Bakke, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **30**, 1550136 (2015); K. Bakke, H. Belich, J. Phys. G, **42**, 095001 (2015), arXiv: 1507.03918; K. Bakke, H. Belich, Ann. Phys. (NY), **360**, 596 (2015), arXiv: 1506.00562; K. Bakke, H. Belich, Ann. Phys. (NY), **354** 1 (2015), arXiv: 1412.5078.

[25] M. Gomes, J. R. Nascimento, A. Yu. Petrov, A. J. da Silva, Phys. Rev. D **81**, 045018 (2010) [arXiv: 0911.3548]; "On the Aether-like Lorentz-breaking action for the electromagnetic field" [arXiv: 1008.0607]; A. P. Baeta Scarpelli, T. Mariz, J. R. Nascimento, A. Yu. Petrov, Eur. Phys. J. C73, 2526 (2013), arXiv: 1304.2256.

[26] R. Casana, M. M. Ferreira, E. O. Silva, E. Passos, F. E. P. dos Santos, Phys. Rev. D87, 047701 (2013), arXiv: 1212.6361.

[27] R. Casana, M. M. Ferreira, R. Maluf, F. E. P. dos Santos, Phys. Lett. B726, 815 (2013), arXiv: 1302.2375.

[28] A. Brignole, Nucl. Phys. B579, 101 (2000), hep-th/0001121.

[29] V. A. Kostelecky, S. Samuel, Phys. Rev. D39, 683 (1989).

[30] I. L. Buchbinder, M. Cvetic, A. Yu. Petrov, Nucl. Phys. B571, 358 (2000), hep-th/9906141.

[31] M. Gomes, J. R. Nascimento, E. Passos, A. Yu. Petrov and A. J. da Silva, Phys. Rev. D **76**, 047701 (2007), arXiv: 0704.1104; J. R. Nascimento, E. Passos, A. Yu. Petrov and F. A. Brito, JHEP **0706**, 016 (2007), arXiv: 0705.1338.

[32] S. Carroll, H. Tam, Phys. Rev. D78, 044047 (2008), arXiv: 0802.0521.

[33] K. Fujikawa and H. Suzuki, Path Integrals and Quantum Anomalies, Oxford Univ. Press, 2004.

[34] V. A. Kostelecky, A. G. M. Pickering, Phys. Rev. Lett. 91, 031801 (2002), hep-ph/0212382.